REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 14-22 are pending.

The Examiner maintains the rejections of claims 1-2 (including claim 3 in page 4 of the Action) and 4-6 from the previous Office Action under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandegren (US Patent No. 6,512,930) in view of Gutfreund (US Patent No. 6,192,394).

The Examiner maintains the rejections of claims 7-8 and 10-12 from the previous Office Action under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandegren/Gutfreund and further in view of Daly (US Patent No. 6,393,014).

Newly added dependent claims 14-22 appear to be also rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandegren.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-12, 14, 16, 18, and 22 are amended.

Thus, claims 1-8, 9-12 and 14-22 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this Amendment. The foregoing rejections are hereby traversed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

The independent claims are 1, 4, 6-8, and 10-12.

The Examiner appears to assert that the Sandegren system can be modified to perform the claimed invention. See, in the Office Action, page 2, items 2 and 3; and, the Examiner's rationale on page 3, in regard to the rejection of independent claims asserting, "Sandegren's invention will send status to ANY person/device on the "notify list" which means the user can add multiple device that they own to the list which reads on the invention."

The Applicants believe that the Examiner's rationale rejecting the claims is not appropriate, because the Examiner suggests that modifying Sandegren to perform the present invention would read on the present invention, which we believe would be the case only after modifying Sandegren system. Such circular rationale actually supports the patentably distinguishing features of the present invention, because the Sandegren WLON would not read on or suggest the claimed invention unless modified as suggested by the Examiner.

In other words, as the Examiner admits in regard to the independent claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12, Sandegren is silent on the idea of providing a status notification system in which a user status generating device ("first information terminal") determines status of a user in communication with the user status generating device and transmits the user status to a device of the same user for further forwarding to another device. Nevertheless the Examiner asserts that Sandegren can be modified to do the same.

In particular, Sandegren provides a "Notify Me" list and a "Notify Others" list to set up a list of users whose status a particular user wants to receive, and to set up a list of users who should be notified whenever a particular user's status changes, respectively (column 3, lines 41 to column 4, line 10). The Examiner appears to assert that Sandegren discloses notification software in the mobile terminal as part of the wireless online notification (WLON) system. Indeed, it appears that Sandegren in column 4, lines 52-65 discloses a WOLN subsystem 203 in the mobile terminal MS-A 201. Then, the Examiner suggests two modifications to Sandegren's WLON to read on the claimed invention, as follows. First, the Examiner appears to assert that a user can load Sandegren's notification software 203 in other devices, such as a laptop, a PC, so that these other devices can notify and be notified as part of the WOLN. Second, the Examiner appears to assert that a user can configure the Sandegren WOLN via the notification lists such that the user's mobile terminal can receives a status from the laptop (see, page 2, items 2 and 3 of the Response to Arguments, and page 3, the paragraph starting with "But is silent on ...," of the Action).

However, the Examiner's rationale is not appropriate as follows.

FIRST

All of the independent claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 10-12, are amended to expressly differentiate a direct electronic transmission medium used in the present invention for communication between a mobile terminal and an external terminal for forwarding status of the user, from Sandegren's configuration in which a mobile communications network is used for communication between the mobile terminal and other mobile terminals for forwarding status of the user.

In particular, the independent claims are further amended to clarify that the "directly transmitting" between a "first information terminal" of a user and "a mobile terminal of the user," is via "*an ad hoc local area network*," using claim 1 as an example, as follows:

> 1. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A status notification method comprising:
>
> determining status of a user using a first information terminal;
>
> directly transmitting the status of the user from the first information terminal to a mobile terminal of the user via an ad hoc local area network ~~electronic information transmission medium~~;
>
> determining at the user mobile terminal whether the received status of the mobile terminal user from the first information terminal is one a plurality of user statuses previously stored in the user mobile terminal;
>
> transmitting the received user status in real-time from the user mobile terminal to a predetermined second information terminal via a mobile communications network, according to the determining; and
>
> outputting at the second information terminal the ~~received~~ user status received from the user mobile terminal via the mobile communications network.

An "an ad hoc local area network" describes, for example, JINI, Plug-And-Play, Bluetooth, low powered wireless communications, etc., type local area network connections. A mobile communications network is a wireless telephone (mobile) network including the Internet. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, on page 16, lines 17-25; page 21, line 20 to page 21, line 8; and FIGS. 1 and 2 of the present Application.

As the Examiner also admits in rejecting independent claims 1 and 4 (page 3 of the Office Action), Sandegren is silent on the recitation "determining status of a user using a first information terminal" (claim 1). The entire disclosure of Sandegren does not disclose or suggest loading the WLON subsystem 203 on devices other than mobile stations MS-A 201, which are all mobile telephones. Although in Sandegren the mobile stations MS-A 201 could possibly be mobile telephones, mobile PDAs, or other mobile devices (column 3, lines 10-18), these devices wirelessly communicate via a wireless telephone (mobile) network as disclosed in FIG. 2 of Sandegren, and therefore the MS-A 201s are all mobile telephones. In other words, even if the Sandegren WLON subsystem 203 is loaded on a PC or a laptop, in Sandegren such a PC or laptop would be in an indirect communication with other mobile stations MS-A 201 via the mobile

telephone network including at least the base station 207, the mobile switching center (MSC) 213 and the WOLN service/HLR node 217, as shown in FIG. 2a of Sandegren. In contrast, the claimed invention is "directly transmitting the status of the user from the first information terminal to a mobile terminal of the user via an ad hoc local area network~~electronic information transmission medium~~" (claim 1 as amended).

For example, as recited in dependent claim 14, such direct communication can be when "the mobile terminal of the user and the at least one first information terminal automatically connect to each other according to the ad hoc local area network, if the mobile terminal is within a predetermined communication range of the at least one first information terminal." In regard to dependent claim 14, the Examiner asserts that addition of such direct communication to the Sandegren WLON system would be obvious (page 7 of the Action). However, Sandegren does not contemplate allowing a computing device (lap top) to directly communicate via an ad hoc local area network, for example, via SUN JINI technology, with one of the Sandegren mobile terminal MS-A 201. Sandegren cannot adopt such a direct ad hoc local area network communication between a laptop and a mobile terminal for providing a status of a user at the laptop to a mobile terminal of the user, because the laptop of Sandegren would be a mobile terminal in communication with the WOLN service node 217 of the mobile telephone network to access the Sandegren notification lists, as shown in FIGS. 2a-b of Sandegren, which would be an indirect communication between the laptop and the WOLN service node 217 or other mobile telephones (see FIGS. 2a-b of Sandegren).

In other words, if as suggested by the Examiner Sandegren adopted a laptop to provide a status of a user to the mobile terminal of the user, the laptop would have to communicate indirectly with the mobile terminal of the user via the WOLN node 217 of the mobile telephone network to provide the status to the mobile terminal of the user. Therefore, attempting to modify Sandegren and alleging that it would read on the claimed invention is substantially undermined, because the modified Sandegren system would still not work like the claimed invention.

Although not clear, the Examiner appears to rely on Daly for a mobile terminal "directly connecting in real-time with an external information terminal" (see, rejections of claims 7-8 and 10-12). However, Daly discloses a system transferring data from an IP network to a mobile station on a non-IP network, which is an indirect communication connection on the IP and non-IP networks, and therefore Daly does not relate to the present invention as recited in the amended claims by "directly connecting in real-time with an external information terminal through ... an ad hoc local area network~~electronic information transmission medium~~."

The recitations of independent claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12 are clearly patentably distinguishing over Sandegren even when interpreted broadly, because they clearly recite, using the recitation of claim 1 as an example, "directly transmitting the status of the user from the first information terminal to a mobile terminal of the user via an ad hoc local area network~~electronic information transmission medium~~."

SECOND

The Sandegren mobile terminal MS-A 201 does not have the capability of directly communicating via an ad hoc local area network connection with another device. The Sandegren mobile terminal MS-A 201 can only communicate with other devices in the WLON via the wireless telephone (mobile) network (i.e., via the mobile switching center 213) as shown in FIGS. 1-2.

For example, in regard to dependent claim 3, the Examiner asserts that Sandegren also discloses a wire/wireless communication (page 4 of the Action). However, in Sandegren, FIGS. 2a-b, the wire communications 211 and 215 are pulse code modulation standard links, such as T1/E1, as part of the wireless telephone (mobile) network (column 4, lines 24-51), and as clearly shown in FIGS. 2a-b, these Sandegren wire links are not like the present invention's "direct" communication links between a "first information terminal" of a user and a mobile terminal of the user "via an ad hoc local area network" (e.g. amended claim 1).

THIRD

Sandegren relates to notifying others or being notified by others, and the various embodiments disclosed by Sandegren do not disclose, suggest or contemplate a user specifying in one of the Sandegren notification lists a mobile terminal of the user, so that a user can be notified of its own status from another device via a direct ad hoc local area network communication link between the device and the user's mobile terminal. For example, Sandegren, columns 7 and 8 are completely silent on the present invention's claimed recitation, "directly transmitting the status of the user from the first information terminal to a mobile terminal of the user via an ad hoc local area network~~electronic information transmission medium~~" (e.g., claim 1 as amended).

FOURTH

In regard to independent claims 4, 7, 8, 11 and 12, the authorizing process is between the "first information terminal" obtaining a status of a user and a mobile terminal of the user receiving its own status via a direct ad hoc local area network communication link (see, FIG. 1 of

the present application) to ensure that the same user whose status is being reported is receiving the status. Sandegren is absolutely silent on such authorizing process, because the Sandegren authorizing process is between a user and another user (column 7, lines 34-47).

FIFTH

In regard to independent claims 8 and 12, the Examiner asserts that Sandegren discloses the present invention's storage means storing user identification information. However, in Sandegren the notification lists, which are a list of other users, are stored in the service node/WOLN database 217 as disclosed in column 5, line 36 to column 7, line 2, and FIGS. 3a, 3d and 3e.

Independent claims 8 and 12 are amended to clarify that in the present invention a mobile terminal storage stores an identification of a user of the mobile terminal for authorization of an external device in direct communication with the mobile terminal of the user, and reporting a status of the user of the mobile terminal, which differs from Sandegren storing user identification of other users.

Therefore, it is believed that independent claims 8 and 12 are allowable.

SIXTH

In summary, Sandegren, Gufruend, and Daly, either alone or combined, do not disclose or suggest forwarding a status of a user at a computing device through a mobile terminal of the user to another mobile terminal, as claimed and as shown in FIG. 1 of the present application. Therefore, in view of the remarks and the claim amendments, entry of the claim amendments is respectfully requested, because it is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/20/04

By: _____
Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501